

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Office Action dated February 20, 2007. As set forth above, Claims 2, 12, 18, 25 and 28 have been amended, and Claims 1, 3-11, 15-17, 19-24, 30 and 31 have been canceled without prejudice. Upon the entry of the amendments, Claims 2, 12-14, 18 and 25-29 are pending in this application. No new matter is added by the amendments as discussed below. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Discussion of Allowable Claims 2, 12-14, 18 and 25-29

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's note that Claims 2, 12-14, 18 and 25-29 would be allowable if amended to independent form. In reply, Applicant has amended Claims 2, 12, 18 and 25 in independent form to incorporate all the limitations of their base and intervening claims. Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 12 and incorporates all the limitations of Claim 12. Claims 26-29 depend from Claim 25 and incorporates all the limitations of Claim 25. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 12-14, 18 and 25-29 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

Discussion of Amendments to Claims 2, 12, 18 and 25

Claims 2, 12, 18 and 25 have been amended to incorporate all the limitations of their base and intervening claims. The amendments to Claims 2, 12, 18 and 25 are supported by the original specification including the original claims. Claim 28 has been amended to correct an error. The amendment to Claim 28 is supported by the original specification, for example, paragraph 19 of the specification and original Claim 13. As such, the amendments do not constitute the addition of new matter. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments.

Discussion of Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 16, 17, 19-22, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art of the record in view of Sindhushayana (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0181744 A1). The Examiner rejected Claims 8-10, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art of the record and Sindhushayana in

Appl. No. : 10/735,508
Filed : December 11, 2003

view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 5,787,122). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner and submits that Claims 1, 3-11, 16, 17, 19-24, 30 and 31 are patentable. However, solely in order to expedite the prosecution to early issuance of a patent, applicant has canceled Claims 1, 3-11, 16, 17, 19-24, 30 and 31 without prejudice. In view of the cancellation, the rejection to Claims 1, 3-11, 16, 17, 19-24, 30 and 31 is moot. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 6/20/07

By: 

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

3880870
061407